DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 191 CE 072 062

AUTHOR	Collard, Betsy; And Others
TITLE	Career Resilience in a Changing Workplace. Information Series No. 366.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Columbus, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	96
CONTRACT	RR93002001
NOTE	53p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center Publications, Center on Education and Training for Employment, 1900 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1090 (order no. IN366: $7; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Development; Career Ladders; Career Planning; Change Strategies; Contracts; *Employee Responsibility; *Employer Employee Relationship; Employment Practices; Organizational Change; Self Actualization
IDENTIFIERS	*Career Resilience; *Self Reliance

ABSTRACT

Major changes in the workplace have changed the social contract between employer and employee and rendered many traditional models of career development inadequate. This paper examines the effects of a changing workplace on the individual and on career development. These changes in the workplace have created new types of organizations and new roles for individuals. Organizations no longer can provide job security and protection. Individuals are required to assume greater responsibility for their careers and must develop new skills and attitudes to manage their own careers. The old employment contract was characterized by a parental relationship and the exchange of loyalty and hard work for job security. A new contract, based on interdependency and the principles of partnership and open and honest communication, is recommended. The evolution of organizational career programs is briefly examined, and changing approaches to career development are explored. A new approach to career development is outlined, based on the concept of individual career self-reliance and a career resilience model for career development is proposed. Contains 61 references. (Author/SK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 396 191

Career Resilience in a Changing Workplace

Information Series No. 366

Betsy Collard
John W. Epperheimer
Diane Saign

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE 072 062

ERIC®
Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, & Vocational Education

CENTER ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR EMPLOYMENT
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Career Resilience in a Changing Workplace

Information Series No. 366

Betsy Collard
John W. Epperheimer
Diane Saign

The Career Action Center

ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Center on Education and Training for Employment
College of Education
The Ohio State University
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

1996

Funding Information

Project Title:	ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Contract Number:	RR93002001
Act under Which Administered:	41 USC 252 (15) and P.L. 92-318
Source of Contract:	Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department of Education Washington, DC 20208
Contractor:	Center on Education and Training for Employment The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090
Executive Director:	Ray D. Ryan
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination Prohibited:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1971 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." The ERIC Clearinghouse project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

Contents

Figures iv

Foreword v

Executive Summary vii

Introduction 1

Background 1
Definitions of Terms 2

Forces Driving Change in the Workplace 5

The Changing Nature of Employment 9

The Changing Employment Contract 13

Evolution of Career Development 21

The Concept of Career Resilience 29

Summary 41

References 45

Figures

1. The Career Self-Reliance Wheel 37

2. The shifting assumptions of career development programs 41

3. Changing characteristics of career development programs 42

Foreword

The Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education (ERIC/ACVE) is 1 of 16 clearinghouses in a national information system that is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education. This paper was developed to fulfill one of the functions of the clearinghouse—interpreting the literature in the ERIC database. It should be of interest to career development and career guidance practitioners and students.

ERIC/ACVE would like to thank Betsy Collard, John W. Epperheimer, and Diane Saign for their work in the preparation of this paper. As director of programs for the Career Action Center (CAC), Betsy Collard is responsible for career management services used by over 20,000 adults annually. She has also served as career consultant for the state of California, established a career planning and placement office at the University of California-Santa Cruz, and was assistant dean at Stanford University. John Epperheimer directs corporate programs for the more than 200 corporate partners of the CAC. He was vice president/manager of EnterChange, a a national outplacement firm and has been a newspaper editor and human resources manager. Executive director of the CAC, Diane Saign has over 20 years of professional and volunteer experiences in organizational development and planning in the corporate and nonprofit sectors.

The following people are also acknowledged for their critical review of the manuscript prior to publication: Douglas T. Hall, Professor, Boston University; John W. Shepard, Psychologist/Organizational Consultant, Midwest Center for Human Resource Development; Margaret M. Bogenschutz, Director, Undergraduate Career Services, College of Business, the Ohio State University; and Bob Towner-Larsen, Career Counselor, College of Education, the Ohio State University.

Publication development was coordinated by Susan Imel. Sandra Kerka edited the manuscript, and Janet Ray served as word processor operator.

Ray D. Ryan
Executive Director
Center on Education and
Training for Employment

Executive Summary

Major changes in the workplace have altered the social contract between employer and employee and rendered many traditional models of career development inadequate. This paper examines the effects of a changing workplace on the individual and on career development. These changes in the workplace have created new types of organizations and new roles for individuals. Organizations no longer can provide job security and protection. Individuals are required to assume greater responsibility for their careers and must develop new skills and attitudes to manage their own careers.

The old employment contract was characterized by a parental relationship and the exchange of loyalty and hard work for job security. A new contract, based on interdependence and the principles of partnership and open and honest communication, is recommended. The evolution of organizational career programs is briefly examined, and changing approaches to career development are explored.

A new approach to career development is outlined, based on the concept of individual career self-reliance, and a career resilience model for career development is proposed.

Information on career resilience may be found in the ERIC database using the following descriptors—*Career Development, Career Ladders, Career Planning, Change Strategies, Contracts, *Employee Responsibility, *Employer Employee Relationship, Employment Practices, Organizational Change; Self Actualization; and identifiers—*Career Resilience, *Self Reliance. Asterisks indicate descriptors and identifiers that are particularly relevant.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

The upheaval in the work force in the United States in the late 1980s and early 1990s has dramatically changed expectations about careers, the scope and emphasis of career development, and the purpose of organizational career development programs. Indeed, the very nature of work itself is undergoing dramatic change. Never has the need for career management been greater Conversely, never have the "rules" for successfully managing one's career been more unclear, save one—we can no longer count on organizations to provide job security.

The fundamental changes in the workplace in the 1990s have also made many traditional career management approaches outdated, especially programs within organizations. Many of the traditional approaches covered in academic literature no longer work as well because the assumptions upon which they were based no longer seem to be appropriate.

This paper is a review and synthesis of selected literature related to the changing nature of career development and the concept of career resilience. This paper examines trends driving changes in the workplace and their effect on career expectations. It discusses the changing nature of employment, the new employment contract and its effect on career programs, and the concept of career resilience as a major new focus in career development. The authors propose that, in order to meet the needs of today's world of work, a new approach to teaching and practicing career development is required—an approach based on career resilience.

Background

The definition of a career and how to manage it changed dramatically in the early 1990s. As the pace of technological and economic change accelerated, downsizing became an accepted management practice in both the public and private sectors. By early 1996, a ***New York Times*** (Uchitelle and Kleinfield 1996) poll showed that nearly three-quarters of all U.S. households had experienced a layoff or had a relative, friend, or neighbor who had lost a job since 1980.

Global competition, the explosion of information technology, and organizational restructuring forced organizations into new

ways of doing business. This in turn made it impossible for organizations to promise lifetime or even long-term employment. The social contract between employer and employee that had evolved to meet the needs of an expanding economy following World War II no longer was viable. As organizations reengineered to improve productivity, structures flattened and moving up became more difficult. Layers of management were eliminated and traditional career ladders disappeared.

Traditional career management programs that were designed for a more stable time were no longer as relevant. Organizational commitments to career management that featured the organization matching an employee to a job or directing an employee's development began to disappear. The expectation of following a predictable career path in one's field or one's company—especially up a career ladder—became outdated.

In 1993, a concept emerged in California to help individuals replace their dependence on organizations for career development with an attitude of career self-reliance. The idea was to help individuals take charge of their career futures and learn how to self-manage their careers effectively in a rapidly changing environment.

Career self-reliance, career resilience, and the concept of a career resilient work force provide the basis for defining a new contract between employer and employee—one that is built on continuous learning, flexibility, change, and an adult-adult relationship.

Definitions of Terms

Career—The totality of work one does in one's lifetime (Sears 1982).

Career Self-Reliance—A lifelong commitment to managing one's worklife actively and learning in a rapidly changing environment (Career Action Center 1995).

Career Resilience—The ability to manage one's career in a rapidly changing environment. The result of being career self-reliant (Career Action Center 1994).

Career Resilient Work Force—A group of career self-reliant employees. "A group of employees who not only are dedicated to the idea of continuous learning but also stand ready to reinvent themselves to keep pace with change, who take responsibility for their own career management, and last but not least, who are committed to the company's success" (Waterman, Waterman, and Collard 1994, p. 88).

Forces Driving Change in the Workplace

The downsizing and restructuring that characterized the 1980s has continued into the mid-1990s. Businesses in the United States announced cuts of 316,047 jobs in 1990, more than 560,000 in 1993, 516,069 in 1994 and 440,000 in 1995, according to Challenger, Gray, and Christmas, an outplacement firm (Murray 1995).

The *New York Times* (Uchitelle and Kleinfield 1996) analyzed job loss figures from the U.S. Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics, which were kept beginning in 1979. That analysis showed 1993 as the year with the highest actual job loss rate, 3.43 million, with 1994 estimated at 3.34 million and 1995 at 3.34 million.

The *Times* concluded that layoffs no longer rise and fall with the economy and affect blue-collar workers, but they have become a way of doing business. In the 1990s, layoffs have claimed almost as many white-collar workers as blue-collar workers. In a National Investor Relations Institute survey of 1,800 investor relations officers, 50 percent indicated the pace of restructuring will stay the same and 35 percent predicted the pace will pick up (Hequet 1995). At the same time, hundreds of thousands of jobs were being created in the United States. The February 1996 job creation total of 705,000 was the highest since 1983 (Marshall 1996).

What felt different for many workers was the pace of job loss and job creation and the changes in the nature of employment opportunities. Information technology, globalization, and reengineering were reshaping organizations, jobs, and the very concept of a career. For more than 50 years, most Americans worked in an environment dominated by large companies with multilevel hierarchies where workers could move up over 20 or 30 years. Kaye and Farren (1996) list six causes for the recent decline of vertical advancement within organizations: changing skill requirements, flattening organizations, the baby boomer bulge, increased automation, contingent workers, and shifting career expectations. Bridges (1994) writes about the "dejobbing"

of America and cites the disappearance of mass production, the introduction of technology, and the outsourcing of work from large to small organizations as significant factors.

Traditional boundaries began to blur by the late 1980s. "At the organizational level, we see in many industries a loosening of the boundaries between suppliers, manufacturers, and customers. . . . At the same time the automation of everything from secretarial work to complex production processes makes all kinds of jobs much less manual and more conceptual" (Schein 1993, p. 44). Information technology and automation made new, higher-level skills necessary. Employees often were not able to develop the skills needed fast enough as U.S. manufacturing transformed itself from moving boxes and assembling pieces to moving information. The required skills were quite different.

Johansen and Swigart (1994) see four boundaries under attack: Who does what—the task boundary; who is in charge of what—the authority boundary; what's in it for us—the political boundary; and who is and isn't one of us—the identity boundary.

The Institute for the Future (1993) identifies changing demographics, information technology and new organizations as the three drivers creating a new work force, with new mobility, new attributes, and new work communities. As part of a move from corporate hierarchy to a networked structure, many, including Barner (1994), describe a new work force consisting of core employees, supplemental employees, and outsourced work functions.

In his book, ***The Age of Unreason***, Charles Handy (1990) provides perhaps the most widely recognized theoretical construct for the forces behind this restructuring with his concept of the shamrock organization. He describes the three leaves of the shamrock as core workers, contract workers, and a flexible labor force of temporary or part-time workers. In his theory of the shamrock organization, Handy calls these workers the core, the flexible labor force, and the contractual fringe. He points out that the end of corporate career ladders offered opportunities for a "horizontal fast-track" and that "a flatter organization can offer opportunities at all ages to discover new abilities and new interests" (p. 138). Handy predicts a weakening of the bond between employer and employee as a new psychological contract is adopted.

The move to outsourcing outlined by Handy has had a significant impact on the workplace. As organizations begin to contract with vendors to provide services not core to their business,

increasing numbers of employees find themselves displaced and moving outside organizations to work for smaller specialized companies who contract with the larger firms.

In 1995, Handy wrote about the virtual organization—an organization based on activities, not buildings. He saw coming to the office more like coming to a club for meetings. Byrne (1993) hails the rise of the virtual corporation, a temporary network of interests that come together quickly to exploit opportunities, linked by information technologies. All of this suggests continual change and redefinition and the need for flexibility in where, when, and how work is done.

The forces driving the change in the workplace have certainly been well documented. Indeed, it is almost impossible to pick up a business magazine or newspaper and not see yet another article on the topic. It is clear that we are in the midst of a very major change in how work is done and what it takes to succeed in a global world where technology provides increasingly rapid challenges and opportunities. All of a sudden the nature of employment seems to have changed and millions of workers are concerned about the loss of employment security.

The Changing Nature of Employment

Assumptions and expectations regarding the nature of employment have shifted significantly over the last decade. From the end of World War II until the mid-1970s, family incomes doubled and an expansive economy offered opportunity for everyone. Employment was long term if not lifelong, career paths were linear, organizations were hierarchical, and work was packaged as a "job." As mergers, acquisitions, reengineering, and downsizings became a part of workers' vocabulary in the late 1980s, there was a growing recognition that the nature of employment was indeed changing.

Bridges (1994) boldly asserts that the result of all the work force upheaval is "the end of jobs as we have known them." The impact, he says, is to make all jobs temporary. Bridges argues that what modern society called "the job" is actually a work arrangement particular to its time and on the wane. "The job," he believes, will be replaced by other new arrangements that will themselves be temporary, because they will have been created to meet the needs of an immediate situation. It is common today to hear the word "work" used instead of the word "job." "Job" seems an outdated concept to growing numbers of career development professionals because it is too restrictive and defined by too many boundaries for the new workplace.

Bridges sees a dramatic shift from the way work used to be done and he advises individuals to recognize the new rules of the workplace. All workers, Bridges writes, should view themselves as contingent workers and demonstrate their value to the organization in every situation. Individuals must develop a vendor mindset, become customer focused, and act as if they are in business for themselves. They must master multitasking and team skills and be ready to move from one organization to another as business needs shift. And, to be successful, workers must manage these transitions themselves.

Job security, which was the promise of the old employer/employee contract, was clearly disappearing by the early 1990s. Otte and Kahnweiler (1995) conclude, "'Job security' has become an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

oxymoron at all levels, and long-range career planning may appear futile" (p. 2). The new "job security" for the 1990s has become employability.

Hall and Moss (1995) argue that in fact only 5 percent of U.S. workers had ever been covered by a policy of lifetime employment security, but they acknowledge the widespread perception among many workers that there was implied security. What really has been broken are two rules about layoffs—it used to be that such actions would occur only during a recession and that only hourly workers would be laid off. Now no one is safe and restructuring often leads to layoffs even in prosperous times.

Many urge workers to let go of the dependent mindset. Hakim (1994) advocates an attitude of being self-employed, exhibiting an "independent and interdependent mindset" and committing to "continuous learning, personal growth, and gaining new perspectives" (p. 133). He defines a dual responsibility for the worker in this new reality: taking responsibility for one's career and growth while making a contribution to the organization and customers. To succeed, the worker has to be self-reliant and independent and customer focused and highly interconnected at the same time.

"To succeed, the worker has to be self-reliant and independent and customer focused and highly interconnected at the same time."

Heckscher's (1995) research on managers draws similar conclusions. He discovered managers who had redefined the concept of careers and modeled a new approach. "On one hand, they believed strongly in individual responsibility for the development of their careers, as opposed to the belief of loyalists that the company owed them career stability. On the other hand, they clearly and strongly rejected the individualistic, 'free agent' model in which money replaces loyalty. They were deeply committed to the success of the company, they were enthusiastic about the mission, and they were believers in teamwork to achieve the corporate goals—at the same time that they remained focused on their own independent careers" (p. 141).

This new self-reliant view of career development is supported by others. Filipczak (1995) urges employees freed from their dependency on companies to begin a journey that ends with the customer—who might be their company.

Harari (1995) points out that the psychological need for a sense of security is more important than ever in times of rapid change, but that companies can no longer offer that to their employees. He proposes a new model of job security based on mastery, on

what one creates, on a feeling of self-reliance, on making a visible, unique contribution, and on taking risks on behalf of the organization.

It was obvious by the early 1990s that the nature of employment had indeed changed for many workers. The patterns were evident everywhere in every industry: government, higher education, health care, manufacturing, retail, the service industries—all were redefining how they did business and the nature of employment. The old employment contract based on a stable, predictable work environment and a dependent, parent/child model was no longer possible. Loyalty and hard work were no longer enough to ensure job security. Ongoing employment in the new world of work would be based on one's employability and where, how, when, and for whom one worked might shift dramatically.

The Changing Employment Contract

In 1965, Schein defined the implicit employment contract between employer and employee this way:

> The organization does certain things to and for the employee and refrains from doing other things. It pays him [sic], gives him status and job security, and does not ask him to do things too far removed from his job description. In exchange, the employee reciprocates by working hard, doing a good job, and refraining from criticizing the company in public or otherwise hurting its image. The organization expects the employee to obey its authority; the employee expects the organization to be fair and just in dealing with him. (p. 44).

Nearly 3 decades later, a new contract, or covenant, is defined by Waterman, Waterman, and Collard (1994):

> Under the new covenant, employers give individuals the opportunity to develop greatly enhanced employability in exchange for better productivity and some degree of commitment to company purpose and community for as long as the employee works there. It is the employee's responsibility to manage his or her own career. It is the company's responsibility to provide employees with the tools, the open environment, and the opportunities for assessing and developing their skills. And it is the responsibility of managers at all levels to show that they care about their employees whether or not they stay with the company. (p. 88)

Those two statements represent the ends of the spectrum spanning the employer-employee relationship, with the change taking place in only 3 decades. Most of the recent writing on the subject is far closer to the position of Waterman et al. and agrees that the goal is no longer job security but employability. In the

new contract, employees are accountable for adding value and the organization is responsible for providing access to learning opportunities and the tools to support that learning so that employees can maintain their employability.

The old contract was characterized by a parental relationship. Loyalty and hard work were at the center. In exchange for hard work and loyalty the employee could expect job security. Protection was offered in exchange for control. Kissler (1994) notes that in this old contract the identity of the employee was defined by the organization, loyalty meant staying with the company (leaving was bad), and employee growth came through promotions. "The key point here is that the old employee contract was enforced by a co-dependency established between the two parties" (p. 347).

A great deal has been written about the emerging contract between employers and employees. Proposed new definitions of the contract include an employment contract, a career contract, a social contract, a psychological contract, and a new covenant.

"

One of the most fundamental principles of the new contract is that it proposes an adult/adult partnership between employer and employee. The partnership is based on open and honest communication.

"

One of the most fundamental principles of the new contract is that it proposes an adult/adult partnership between employer and employee. The partnership is based on open and honest communication. Under the old contract, communication was on a need-to-know basis and rarely was bad news shared—managers did not want to worry employees. It was part of the parent/child relationship. Under the new contract, ongoing open and honest communication about the good, the bad, and the "what ifs" is a fundamental principle.

The shift from a co-dependent, parental relationship to one built on the principles of partnership is only now beginning to take hold. Block (1993) advocates being open and honest with employees as a key to changing the relationship from paternalism to partnership. Bartlett and Ghosal (1994) urge that organizations build a relationship with employees based on purpose and process in order to build commitment. Morrison (1994) sees psychological contracts as adding predictability, which he terms "probably the most important issue for human relationships" (p. 359).

The loyalty factor in the old contract seems no longer as appropriate in the new contract. As organizations can no longer demand or give loyalty, it will cease to be a motivator (Kanter 1995). Kanter asks: What will motivate? Mission, something to

believe in; agenda control, a say in what happens; sharing value creation, rewards, and recognition; reputation; learning.

Some view loyalty, the cornerstone of the old ethic, no longer a realistic expectation because loyalty fosters stability and the new world of work needs flexibility and diversity. Heckscher (1995) suggests that loyalty is at odds with the need for ongoing flexibility because it is based on the promise of long-term security. It also demand homogeneity in that it requires individuals to subordinate their personal needs and goals to those of the organization. He suggests a new contract where individuals with commitments and organizations with a mission come together in a professional relationship.

Heckscher calls this new relationship a professional employment contract that would balance the needs of independent individuals and those of mission-focused organizations. In the new contract organizations would expect individuals to build their own identities and careers. Together, individual workers and the organization would create a "community of purpose" where they would share a commitment to a mission without having a dependent relationship.

In Heckscher's view of the new contract:

> Individuals are committed not to any company as such, but to a personal set of skills, goals, interests, and affiliations. The company offers them not permanent employment, but challenges that give an opportunity to develop interests, and a promise of mutual dialogue and openness to manage the two sets of needs. When the two are synchronized, the employees become dedicated to accomplishing the current mission, working with others who are similarly dedicated. They offer not obedience, but intelligence: they will not do whatever they are asked, but they *will* do whatever they can to further the mission. The relationship lasts as long as the organizational vision and the individual commitments are close enough to lead to a sense of mutual contribution. After that . . . it is "time to move on to something else." (pp. 145-146)

Hakim (1994) captures the thinking of many when he espouses the following new contract: "That we are all self-employed inside and outside of organization. Independence—striving to

know and rely on one's self—and interdependence—the ability to collaborate with others, are the contract's core elements" (p. xiii).

Champy (1995) also proposes a new contract. The company will be aggressive in the pursuit of new ideas, services, products, and markets. It will be diligent in the pursuit of "a culture of willingness," fair, equitable, and open with people. Employees will use their best efforts to contribute to new ideas, services, products, markets, customers; use skills and capabilities to serve customers; participate in a culture of willingness; do work and help others do their work; and be fair, open, and equitable with others.

Employability and individual responsibility are themes that run through all the proposed versions of the new contract. Harari (1995) describes the new contract as one in which the employer helps the employee become stronger and more marketable, and the employee commits to taking personal accountability for individual and organizational growth. Harari calls this "the new loyalty."

Hall and Moss (1995) define the emerging contract as a protean career contract. The goal is achieving psychological success and is characterized by a "lifelong series of experiences, skills, learnings, transitions and identity changes" (p. 11). The term protean career was suggested originally by Hall more than 20 years ago. The term derives from the Greek god Proteus, who could change shape at will; it describes "a process which the person, not the organization, is managing" (ibid.).

The concept of a boundaryless career is proposed by Mirvis and Hall (1994). They warn that the old psychological contract must be replaced in the minds of workers so they no longer expect upward mobility. They predict role overload and conflict among workers and a struggle to find a substitute for the organization's definition of success. They suggest that workers see careers as a series of repeated developmental cycles. The resulting adaptability would be a way to experience psychological success. They point out that such adaptability would also be sought by boundaryless organizations. "The key point here is that as new career options open up boundaries around work so also will they open up boundaries of identity" (p. 372).

Mirvis and Hall see the psychological contract between employers and employees shifting from a relational to a transactional contract. Under the relational contract, the responsibility is on the employer, which has job security as a company policy.

Under the transactional contract, the responsibility is on the worker, who is employed based on current value to the organization.

Acceptance of the boundaryless organization would come well ahead of the acceptance of the boundaryless career, according to Mirvis and Hall. They predict that people might identify themselves more with their work and less with any particular organization. This indeed does seem to be happening, according to a number of career development practitioners. Individuals are looking to their profession, their field of work as a source of identity. They realize that in a transactional work relationship and in a workplace characterized by overlapping, rapid change, their ongoing employability is anchored more in their ability to keep pace with their profession and the reputation they build with their peers than it is with any one organization.

Mirvis and Hall reflect the opinion of many in seeing the new contract as one in which the organization offers stimulation and developmental experiences to people in exchange for their professional services. "This will see employers making every effort to attract and retain people under the guidelines that employees change jobs frequently, move laterally willingly, and take increased responsibility for developing themselves and their careers" (p. 377).

More recently, Hall and associates (1996) describe a new "relational contract" where the individual gives "strong performance in response to customer needs, continuously learning in relation to others, with adaptability in developing new competencies as the business environment changes" (p. 5). The element that holds the contract together is "business success, clarity of purpose and direction (for the individual and the organization), and healthy levels of mutual connection, respect, and trust" (ibid.). The relationship is situationally determined and there is no expectation of a long-term relationship.

The Career Action Center (1993) defines the emerging contract in much the same way. It frames the new contract in terms of career resilience. Individuals who are career resilient contribute skills aligned with business needs, are dedicated to continuous learning and committed to personal excellence, have an attitude that is focused but flexible, and deliver solid performance in support of organizational goals for as long as they are a part of the organization. The organization in turn selects business opportunities with growth potential, offers the opportunity to do challenging work, provides support for continuous learning,

“Individuals who are career resilient contribute skills aligned with business needs, are dedicated to continuous learning and committed to personal excellence, have an attitude that is focused but flexible, and deliver solid performance in support of organizational goals for as long as they are a part of the organization.”

gives access to development resources (career development and skill development), fosters honest and open communication, and builds an environment that integrates these values into the business strategy. The "no-fault" relationship lasts as long as it is mutually beneficial for the individual and the organization.

Most organizations are only starting to redefine the new contract in terms of their business culture. The process is slow and uneven. Even with commitment from the top of the organization, different groups within any organization are at different stages of understanding and readiness. Even those who are the most committed to the new relationship find themselves sometimes operating on the basis of the old contract. Institutional policies and governmental regulations are not keeping up with the pace of change and many policies and practices are still based on old models and assumptions. The expectation is that the shift from one way of doing business to another should happen quickly and smoothly. That view is of course not realistic. This shift represents major change in attitudes, roles, and responsibilities. It will take time.

Although the new contract is still emerging, its basic elements are already clear. There is an emphasis on employability rather than job security. The contract is based on a new kind of interdependence between employer and employee, one that requires a number of individual responsibilities and shared commitments. It is built on an adult/adult relationship requiring greater accountability and self-direction on the part of the employee. It is a contract that is designed to last as long as individual skills, motivations, and contribution align with organizational need.

Many individuals will learn to prosper under the emerging contract, especially those who are self-directed and have skills that the market demands. Others will find it more difficult. Hall and associates (1996) point out the difficulty of moving from a contract where personal identity was tied to formal work roles within organizations to working independently. The contingent employment patterns that characterize today's employment patterns can make even the most self-directed person feel unconnected and without an anchor. Many are turning more and more to professional associations and similar groups for a sense of community, and new programs are developing within communities to meet the needs of these new "independent workers" (Career Action Center 1995).

The new contract presents special difficulties for those with less education or lower-level skills, and those who do not have the

self-confidence and/or skills needed to take responsibility for their ongoing employability. It is this group that stands to be hurt most by the new employer/employee relationship.

There is increased public discussion about the impact the new contract will have on those who are less skilled and on society as a whole. The challenge the new contract presents for lower-skilled workers is tremendous. It requires greater public attention and must be jointly addressed by the corporate, government, education, and nonprofit sectors as the work world requires increased skills and ongoing learning to keep pace. The impact is profound; it requires collaboration and commitment from all sectors if we want to have a society based on the concept of full employment.

Evolution of Career Development

A review of organizational career development programs reflects the changing nature of the definition of careers, career development, and the employer-employee contract in all industry sectors, both private and public. Schein (1978) focuses on the interaction of the individual and the organization over time and develops the concepts of natural stages of one's career, paralleling the aging process and focusing on power, influence, and authority levels as well as learning. The concept of career paths is explored by Leibowitz, Farren, and Kaye (1986). They describe career success from the viewpoint of employees as having a process to plan to manage their careers. The process involves the opportunity to get help from managers in career decision making, a method of defining their own career targets matched with organizational needs, and a concrete plan for their own development.

The past intra-organizational emphasis of organizational career programs is chronicled by Arthur (1994), who surveyed articles in five journals from 1980-1992. The top themes are environmental stability, intra-organizational focus, managerial, and professional or hierarchical careers.

Kaye (1985) describes the organizational payoffs of having a career development program for employees: "Skill building, talent matching, productivity and morale, motivation, revitalization, advancement from within, recruitment, human resource planning, problem identification, image building, goal commitment, program integration, equal opportunity, legal implications" (pp. 14-15).

Factors influencing the need for organizational career development are identified by Slavenski and Buckner (1988): identify and forecast personnel needs; social and demographic trends; changing nature of work; changing types of jobs; equity and a multicultural work force; worker productivity; technological change and decreasing advancement opportunities; organizational philosophies.

The theme of meeting organizational needs is sounded again by Gilley (1988): "Career development is now an accepted human

resource strategy among training and development administrators, personnel officers and organizational consultants. The principal aim of such programs has been to help employees analyze their abilities and interests to better match personnel needs for growth and development with the needs of the organization. . . . The primary motives for an organization to implement a career development program are the desire to develop and promote employees from within, as well as a desire to reduce turnover" (p. 62). Gilley also cites career pathing as an important activity.

As recently as 1993, Gutteridge, Leibowitz, and Shore listed three main drivers of career development programs: promotion from within, a shortage of promotable talent, and an organizational commitment to career development. Note that the first two still relate to upward mobility.

The thinking regarding career development programs has shifted considerably in the past 3-5 years. In our experience, it is much less common today to find organizations developing programs for internal promotional reasons or to match employees with specific organizational needs. Programs today tend to frame career development more in terms of learning and development, not change or movement. Often they are a part of a broader development initiative within the organization and their focus is on helping employees take responsibility for their learning and ongoing employability. Many times these programs develop in response to employee concern expressed in employee satisfaction surveys. In some organizations they are driven from the top and are part of the overall business strategy of the organization. This is of course highly desirable because then they are much more likely to have a systemic impact.

Gutteridge et al.'s (1993) survey of organizational human resources leaders indicated a number of key success factors. Human resource professionals involved in career management programs recommended involving top management early to obtain visible support, setting clear principles, starting from the line up, and maintaining flexibility. Essential aspects of initiating a career management program are listed by Kaye and Leibowitz (1994): articulating a need, stating a vision of success, creating a plan, and developing a sustaining mechanism. Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) point to the importance of building commitment to the occupation as well as to the organization.

Special career development needs of nonexempt employees are identified by Leibowitz, Feldman, and Mosley (1992), who write

that job satisfaction for nonexempts often derives more from their relationships with coworkers than from the work itself, due to the routine nature of their duties.

Until recently, many researchers advocated a key role for managers. "Line managers must be the heart and soul of a career development program. The average manager, however, needs guidance and a defined structure in which to do so" (Carulli, Norian, and Levine 1989, p. 68). Kaye (1985) sees managers as the key to the success of career programs. She indicates that programs provide "communication, information, goal clarity, developmental responsibilities, staffing justification, identification, special projects, personnel decisions, performance appraisal, motivation, personal development" (p. 15). The employee in turn receives "self-knowledge, organizational knowledge, self-determination, organizational identity, skill building, experimentation, supervisory relations, peer relations, personal satisfaction, advancement potential, job enrichment" (ibid.).

Although little seems to have been written about it yet, there is a strong indication that organizations are moving away from the manager having a central role in an employee's career development. Managers report that in downsized organizations, they have little time, and many do not feel qualified to offer career advice. In addition, organizations adopting the concepts of career resilience and/or career self-reliance find that management control or direction of individual careers runs counter to the new contract. The new direction that is just now emerging is that employee career development is "individually owned, management supported."

"There is a strong indication that organizations are moving away from the manager having a central role in an employee's career development."

Souerwine (1992) makes a distinction between the role of the manager and the role of the professional career counselor and questions whether managers can play the role of counselor because of the power a manager holds over an employee. Souerwine views the manager as "a planner, controller, trainer, coach, recruiter, outplacer, rewarder, allocator of resources, a person hired to achieve a certain agreed-upon or not agreed-upon result. These things are done in a fairly structured, controlled, and formal system of relationships and responsibilities, where organizational values and objectives dictate vested interests" (p. 310).

Souerwine sees the counselor as being present to help employees help themselves. "The counselor is more concerned with the 'being' of the client, his/her emotions and feelings, the diagnosis of issues that lead to self-acceptance, integrity, change,

empowering by the client. The counselor does this in a context of developing personal and confidential relationships, of being responsive to the client's interests and objectives, and helping the client learn how to solve problems for him/herself. The counselor is, therefore, more nonjudgmental, nondirective, discovery-oriented, and person-centered than is the manager" (p. 310). Souerwine contends that managers cannot counsel, but they can be taught to use counseling roles such as "coach, mentor, recruiter, trainer, and evaluator" (p. 313). He identifies the need for an organizational culture that allows career self-management.

As employment security has disappeared, the demand from workers for career programs has increased, reported Breuer (1995), who finds that career growth and employability are top issues of concern to employees, according to human resources executives.

In the new career programs, Caudron (1994) sees the responsibility for career management resting with employees. "They must pull themselves up by the bootstraps. Companies can't, and won't, do it for them" (p. 64N). There is evidence these programs have new approaches and new goals. Hakim (1994) advocates a career self-management approach, in which the organization joins workers in a common effort by offering career guidance, opportunities for experimentation and by encouraging ongoing learning, both personal and professional. Caudron (1994) reports: "Clearly, the focus of career management today is shifting from the employer being responsible for an employee's career, toward the employee taking responsibility for his or her career growth. The effort to permanently change this paradigm doesn't stand a chance, however, if organizations don't communicate with employees about their new responsibilities and the reasons for them" (p. 64N).

New themes are emerging in career programs. A focus on learning is certainly one of the major themes. The sign of a good career program today is helping the employee understand the importance of continuous learning in building and maintaining employability and providing tools and access to learning experiences that build skills.

The reframing of the word career is another emerging characteristic. Increasingly, a career is viewed more as a series of life experiences and a journey, not bound by a given occupation, any specific linear path, or "career" in the old sense.

In urging new studies on career issues, Arthur (1994) classifies some of the key themes in modern career programs: individual reputation-building, psychological adjustment, interdependent effects of careers and organizations upon one another, interweaving of networking, learning and enterprise, and the belief that careers constitute threads that bind people, firms, and industry regions together.

Arthur argues for a psychological adjustment by workers toward themes of networking and learning. This is similar to the call by Hakim (1994) for a commitment to continuous learning and to viewing a career as a lifetime endeavor. These views are congruent with the theories of Hudson (1991), who puts forth a cyclical view of adult life, which develops "through cycles of change and continuity rather than in progressive, straight lines" (p. 43). Hudson believes human systems are resilient and can adapt and that continuous learning is essential to constant improvement. This view of adult development parallels the new view of career management. Kotter (1995) urges workers never to stop trying to grow and said lifelong learning "is increasingly necessary for success" (p. 181).

Barner (1994) advocates the career strategist model for individuals, a multidirectional, probabilistic model of career management:

> Under the new model, you will not chart a rigid career path toward a single, long-term goal; instead, you will keep your planning flexible to avoid being caught off-guard by disruptive change. You'll determine how best to shift your career direction to increase your career satisfaction. And you'll use multi-dimensional planning, pursuing several clustered objectives that meet your career needs at a particular point in your life.
>
> Instead of job security, career strategists will seek job resiliency—developing the skills and flexibility needed to quickly respond to shifting employer requirements. Their career goals are no longer age-dependent, so they are free to pursue new directions at any point in their lives. (p. 15)

Kram (1996) advocates a new relational approach to career development built on the ways individuals learn and grow in their work in a workplace that is constantly changing. Traditional career development models viewed relationships as a way

experienced midcareer individuals could share learning and offer support to novices. Kram finds the established views inadequate in a world where both experienced individuals and those just beginning careers must continually be learning and developing new skills to meet changing requirements. In a sense both are novices and both are both mentors and "co-learners."

It used to be that the career counselor's role was to match individuals to occupations. In an era when there were a common and stable set of duties that role was a reasonable one (Krumboltz 1996). The industrial age, Krumboltz points out, required large numbers of workers within occupational categories and they performed virtually identical tasks. Today workers are being expected to do the work that is needed to be done. Today career counselors need to play a much broader role. It is no longer about occupational selection but a whole array of career issues. Krumboltz points to a number of these issues: loss of control, career obstacles and behaviors, job search knowledge, job search motivation, job relationships, job burnout, occupational advancement, and retirement planning.

Krumboltz (1996) proposes a new Learning Theory of Career Counseling, which builds on his earlier Social Learning Theory of Career Decision Making (Krumboltz 1979). In this new model, "the goal of career counseling is to facilitate the learning of skills, interests, beliefs, values, work habits and personal qualities that enable each client to create a satisfying life within a constantly changing work environment" (Krumboltz 1996, p. 61). The role of the career counselor is to promote client learning that will foster healthy career development for today's world.

Within the last decade there have been important shifts in the evolution of career development and the issues, goals, and emphasis of programs and roles. Within organizations, career development has moved from focusing on traditional programs designed to meet organizational needs and emphasizing movement up a career ladder to programs advocating career self-management with a focus on learning and development. There is evidence that the role of manager in these programs is also changing as the emphasis on personal "ownership" of one's career is growing. Career development within organizations is moving from "management owned" to "employee owned, management supported." There is evidence of programs being made available to a broader range of employees and special attention being given to those most likely to be affected by changes in the way work is done.

"Career development within organizations is moving from "management owned" to "employee owned, management supported."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The newer career development programs and the principles on which they are based support the concept of career resilience, a term that grew in use during the first half of the 1990s to respond to the changing nature of employment and in new relationships being established between organizations and their employees.

The Concept of Career Resilience

By the early 1990s, as the fundamental changes in the workplace became widely recognized, it became obvious that the traditional approach to career development needed to be modified. Professionals at career development conferences and career counselors meeting informally began to discuss how traditional approaches and models no longer seemed as useful. New thinking, new models, and tools were needed. Themes such as acting like an independent contractor, resilience, learning, and flexibility began to emerge.

A great deal has been written about these new themes and what they mean for the individual. Hakim (1994) advocates a "self-employed" attitude and urges the use of "personal redeveloping." He defines it as "the harnessing of your creativity, abilities, beliefs, thoughts, and actions in order to rethink, redefine, and reconstruct your job or career to achieve fulfillment and productivity" (p. 25). Hakim's streamlined approach to personal redevelopment asks, "What do I want? What will others buy? What do I have to bring?"

Bridges (1994) also urges self-responsibility for one's career. He labels this concept "you & co.," which he says requires employability, vendor mindedness, and resilience. He points out that those without a clear development strategy for continually upgrading their skills in line with customer needs would find themselves with fewer and fewer options.

Otte and Kahnweiler (1995) advocates a career planning model for the 21st century built around a quest for personal development. Koonce (1995) identifies 14 winning habits to managing a career. Included are "Don't rely on your boss or organization to define your career path or options" and "Commit to continuous, lifelong learning."

Gelatt and Gelatt (1995) see career development in the new workplace moving from a stable, linear progression to being more like river rafting. They believe that career development cannot be separated from organizational development, personal development, or life development. "To see yourself (your mind's eye, beliefs, attitudes, point of view, personal paradig... as your

greatest resource in your life development will be the key factor in a new model of life development" (p. 5). They advocate a more holistic approach to career/life development, a systems approach that they call "self/system/synergy." Self represents the inner dimensions of career/life development, systems represents the outer dimensions, and synergy represents the interconnectedness of inside and outside.

They urge individuals to become self-searching, systems sensitive, and synergy seeking. Synergy seeking is more than matching. "It involves maintaining self-identity while constantly changing oneself in order to say connected to the environment—a process of putting all the parts together, in harmony, in order to synchronize the whole" (p. 3).

Gelatt and Gelatt's model of self/system/synergy provides a new way for thinking about career development. "Our old models are not obsolete, they are inadequate" (p. 9). Their new mental model does not replace the trait and factor approach introduced by Parsons almost 90 years ago. Instead, it stresses the importance of looking at the whole and "of being aware of the seamlessness of everything, including vocational choice and life development. . . . Self/system/synergy is a model of total life development, not only career development. It is a model of being in continuous growth, not of becoming grown up. And it sees career-life development as a do-it-yourself operation that you can't do alone" (p. 7).

Among the earliest and perhaps the most broadly used term around these new approaches was developed as the result of the work of the Career Action Center (CAC), a nonprofit organization founded in 1973 in Palo Alto, California. In the early 1990s, the center's staff began to study the issues their clients were facing and to identify the skills, abilities, and characteristics that were needed for success in the new workplace. We drew on the work of Carnevale (1991) and others who had identified the core competencies and skills needed for success in the 21st century. It was as a result of this effort that the CAC developed the concept of "career self-reliance" in 1993 and adopted it as our mission. We saw career self-reliance as the way to build career resilience and began to link the two terms.

We defined career self-reliance as "the ability to actively manage one's work life in a rapidly changing environment; the attitude of being self-employed, whether inside or outside an organization." The goal of this new approach to career management was

to help people learn how to succeed in a new world of work by aking personal responsibility and initiative.

Advocating an "attitude of being self-employed" was considered a bold concept in 1993. Little had been written about it at that point. Individuals were often startled by the responsibility it suggested. It was a powerful statement and it captured people's attention, which was the goal. Today, the concept has gained considerable acceptance and it is no longer as surprising to most individuals. Increasingly, workers recognize that they must take responsibility for their own careers and that organizations can no longer provide the same career ladders or career direction that they once could.

Initially, there was considerable concern expressed by organizations and some career development professionals about the "self-employed attitude" advocated in the original definition of career self-reliance. They thought it seemed too independent and focused on too much on self-interest. As the concept grew in acceptance many began to recognize that the *attitude* of self-employment was exactly what top performers within organizations had always demonstrated—characteristics such as initiative, customer focus, a willingness to do the work that needed to be done, etc. As Bridges (1994) writes, "they look at the business at hand as if they had an ownership stake in it" (p. 165).

"The *attitude* of self-employment was exactly what top performers within organizations had always demonstrated—characteristics such as initiative, customer focus, a willingness to do the work that needed to be done, etc."

Career self-reliance is a balance between being self-directed *and* interconnected (Collard 1993). It is based on self-knowledge. Those who are career self-reliant know the skills, interests, and style that bring them satisfaction in their work. They are values driven: they are clear about what is important to them in their work and life and base decisions on that self-knowledge. It is that knowledge about self that provides direction in a work world that is defined by constant change. Those who are self-directed and know what brings them satisfaction in their work are more able to maintain a sense of control and find direction in times of rapid change.

As change becomes more rapid, as organizations no longer can promise job security and greater productivity is required, the desire to find work that is fulfilling and values driven becomes a growing concern to many workers—"If I can't have job security and I have to work the kind of hours I work, I might as well do something I really enjoy." Individuals are looking for work that is meaningful to them and in which their values and those of the organization are aligned.

Individuals and career development professionals well understand the importance of values-driven, meaningful work and the power it brings, but organizations sometimes have difficulty understanding how a search for meaningful work aligns with business interests, and thus are sometimes reluctant to give adequate attention to the self-assessment aspect of career development programs. What is important for organizations to recognize is that when people are doing work that is aligned with their skills, values, and interests they are much more likely to be highly motivated and productive and that in turn builds organizational effectiveness. Helping individuals gain the kind of self-knowledge that leads to an understanding of their best work is in the best interest of both the individual and the organization.

The interdependence aspect of career self-reliance is addressed by Kahn (1996). Drawing on Bowlby's (1973) work, Kahn points out that there is an inherent paradox in self-reliance. Individuals can become fully self-reliant only when they are supported and trusted by others. The interconnectedness and relationship element in career self-reliance that is essential for individuals to do their best work.

"

Career self-reliance is not about being a solitary, isolated individual alone against the world; it is about individual accountability and employability in a world that is rapidly changing, about learning to work effectively with others in new ways to achieve mutual goals.

"

In a rapidly changing world, interdependencies, including multiple relationships between "co-learners" (Hall and associates 1996), are essential to individual career development. In new, team-based work environments, it is how work gets done; in a world in continual flux, it is the way workers get the information and support they need to be successful in their careers. Career self-reliance is not about being a solitary, isolated individual alone against the world; it is about individual accountability and employability in a world that is rapidly changing, about learning to work effectively with others in new ways to achieve mutual goals. Programs focusing on career resilience have a strong component on building connectivity skills—how to develop and maintain a growing network of contacts in order to accomplish work and succeed in a career.

The interdependency aspect of career self-reliance also suggests an organizational responsibility in building a new employment contract where individuals commit to develop career self-reliance and the organization commits to providing an environment that supports learning and development for ongoing employability.

As the concept of career self-reliance began to gain acceptance, the CAC started to examine the issues organizations faced regarding career management. If career self-reliance was what individuals needed in this new workplace, what was

organizations needed from their employees? The answer to that question led to the development of the term *a career resilient work force*. The early work of the CAC, documented in a ***Harvard Business Review*** article by Waterman, Waterman, and Collard (1994) titled "Toward a Career Resilient Workforce," defined a career resilient work force as "a group of employees who not only are dedicated to the idea of continuous learning but also stand ready to reinvent themselves to keep pace with change, who take responsibility for their own career management, and last but not least, who are committed to the company's success" (Waterman et al. 1994, p. 88).

From an organizational view, what companies need to survive and thrive in today's new economic environment is a work force with the skills and attitudes necessary to respond quickly to changing business conditions. They need a work force made up of career self-reliant individuals who can be true partners with the organization in working toward mutual goals.

The terms career self-reliance and career resilience are often used interchangeably. By 1994, career self-reliance was a term used widely to refer to individual career self-management; as the term career resilient work force grew in acceptance as an organizational goal, career resilience began to be used to refer to individual career development.

The dictionary definition of resilience focuses on the ability to bounce back or rebound. There has been a considerable amount of psychological research on resilience, especially in children. Conner (1993) writes about resilience and change and how it relates to managers.

As early as 1987, London and Moore used the term career resilience to describe a basic component of career motivation. They define the term as "the ability to adapt to changing circumstances, even when the circumstances are discouraging or disruptive." They identify four elements of career resilience: "self-confidence, the need for achievement, the willingness to take risks, and the ability to act independently and cooperatively, depending on the situation." Behaviors that demonstrate these factors include easily adjusting to changes; doing one's best, taking initiative to do what is needed to achieve career goals, articulating one's ideas even when unpopular, seeking projects that would require learning new skills, and being innovative.

London and Moore believe career resilience is a characteristic that starts early in life and is probably fairly well established by

the time individuals start their careers. Although they believe that career resilience can be affected by the work environment, they do not believe organizations can provide the environment needed for its development.

The Career Action Center's view of career resilience has many similarities to London and Moore's. We define career resilience, however, as the result or the outcome of being career self-reliant. Although some people develop career resilience early in life, we believe that individuals can develop—and many are developing—career resilience by adopting career self-reliant attitudes and behaviors. Further, we believe that organizations have a significant role and responsibility in providing an environment that helps build career resilience in its workers.

Career self-reliance and career resilience are often used interchangeably and in fact they embrace the same concepts. Some human resource and career development professionals find the term career self-reliance overly bold and prefer the term career resilience. Others find the term career resilience too reactive and prefer career self-reliance because it indicates initiative and accountability and carries with it the feeling that "you're in charge of your career."

"

One of the most important aspects of career self-reliance and career resilience is that it shifts the emphasis of career development from being event driven to being a lifelong process.

"

One of the most important aspects of career self-reliance and career resilience is that it shifts the emphasis of career development from being event driven to being a lifelong process. Career development historically has tended to focus on vocational choice, career change and transitions, or on making career adjustments. The career resilience model says that individuals engage in an ongoing process of career development in order to stay healthy and well in their careers in a work world that is characterized by rapid change and turmoil. It is not that traditional career development models are obsolete; it is simply that they are no longer enough and need to be seen in a broader context.

If career development under this new approach is about staying well and fit in one's career, then it suggests that traditional self-assessment instruments used in career programs may well be limiting. Traditionally, self-assessment has been based on assessing an individual's skills, interests, values, and style. It is an internal evaluation that helps identify how and where one does his/her best work. It is the foundation for making decisions about meaningful, satisfying work. Career self-reliance and career resilience begin with that kind of assessment but they require more.

Self-assessment in the career resilience model includes a broad-based skills assessment. Traditional career development focuses on motivated, transferable skills that are assessed by looking inward. Career resilience requires an assessment of one's marketable skills as well, and that assessment is accomplished by looking externally. How current are one's work content skills, the skills they use to do their job? How do they measure up against market demands and standards of excellence in their field? Ongoing assessment of this kind is required when change is rapid and individual responsibility for career management is the model.

The external evaluation of skills that is needed in an expanded view of self-assessment must also include an examination of one's work strategy or work effectiveness skills. These are the skills that individuals use to accomplish their work and succeed in the workplace. These are the skills identified by Carnevale (1991) and others that are required for success in the 21st century; 360° feedback instruments often focus on assessing these types of skills.

In addition to an expanded view of self-assessment, career self-reliance requires that individuals seek out information about their external environment on an ongoing basis. First individuals need information about requirements, trends, and practices within their organization. London (1996) discusses the insight employees need to have about how their organization is structured and the processes used to accomplish work. Individuals also need information about requirements and trends in their field and industry.

To maintain career health, workers need to benchmark their skills and knowledge against the best practices of their field on an ongoing basis and assess their employability, and they need to be aware of general business and industry trends that might affect them (for example, the use of the Internet, the introduction of a new software technology, the trend toward outsourcing within some industries). Career development programs based on the principles of career self-reliance must include this kind of ongoing external scanning. They must focus on helping individuals identify skill gaps and establish development plans, and they must help connect individuals with the educational and learning opportunities that might support their development plan.

As a result of its experience working with both individuals and organizations, the Career Action Center refined its definition of

career self-reliance in 1995, defining it as "a lifelong commitment to actively managing one's worklife and learning in a rapidly changing environment."

To elaborate the concept further, the definition was accompanied by six key characteristics:

> **Self-Aware**—You know who you are and where and how you do your best work. You understand and can articulate the value you add.
>
> **Values Driven**—You have determined the values that give direction and meaning to your work.
>
> **Dedicated to Continuous Learning**—You regularly benchmark your skills and create a personal and professional development plan to keep your skills current.
>
> **Future Focused**—You look ahead to assess customer needs and business trends. You consider the impact of those trends on your work and your development plan.
>
> **Connected**—You maintain a network of contacts for learning and sharing ideas. You work collaboratively with others toward mutual goals.
>
> **Flexible**— You anticipate change and are ready to adapt quickly.

This expanded definition of career self-reliance, with its emphasis on learning and dealing with change, eliminates the specific and somewhat limiting emphasis on the attitude of being self-employed, although the six characteristics certainly describe individuals who act as if they were self-employed whether working for an organization or not.

To illustrate the concept of career self-reliance and resilience, the CAC developed a model. The *Career Self-Reliance Wheel* (figure 1), divided into three equal parts, shows the need for ongoing learning and growth in three areas:

> **Who you are and where you are going**—This involves using career planning skills that help individuals assess career interests, values, motivated skills, and style and identify where and how

Figure 1. The Career Self-Reliance Wheel

©1996 by Career Action Center. All rights reserved.

they do their best work. This helps individuals identify work that is meaningful and satisfying and provides the foundation for career growth and direction.

What you do—These technical/functional skills are the job content skills that are at the core of an individual's profession or field. They are the skills that help keep a person marketable and often require constant upgrading to keep pace with change.

How you work with others—These work strategy skills contribute to one's work effectiveness. They are the skills employers value in today's workplace: initiative, leadership, teamwork, communication, thinking, and problem-solving skills. These skills also help keep an individual marketable and require ongoing development to increase effectiveness.

"

Although each individual must take responsibility for his/her career, each of us is a part of a larger system and it is our connectedness with others as well as our individual accountability that leads to career success.

"

The concept of career self-reliance is based on wellness; it is about staying fit and healthy in one's career. It reframes career development around the learning model. Its focus is not on movement and/or transition, but on growth and learning. It is not event driven, but proactive and ongoing. It requires personal initiative and taking individual responsibility for managing one's worklife. It includes abilities as well as attitudes. And, perhaps most important, it is based on a systems view: it requires both independence (self-direction) and interdependence (interconnectedness). It recognizes that, although each individual must take responsibility for his/her career, each of us is a part of a larger system and it is our connectedness with others as well as our individual accountability that leads to career success. These principles, the six key characteristics, and the definition of career self-reliance are the basis of the career resilience concept.

Increasingly, individuals are beginning to understand the principles that underlie career resilience: They realize that they must actively manage their careers and "own" their employability; no one else will or can do it for them. Organizations too are beginning to understand the role that career resilience can play in achieving the new employment contract with employees and that career development programs can directly contribute to long-term business strategy.

As Bridges (1994) and others point out, models for this concept in organizations have existed in the U.S. film industry for years. The formation and reformation of teams to develop and bring new products to market, so prevalent in high technology, fosters career resilience and offers another example. Where rigid job duties are specified and where organizational structures are more hierarchical, such as in the defense industry and some unionized environments, the concept of resilience is more likely to meet with resistance.

Nonetheless, career development programs within organizations that embrace the principles of career self-reliance have grown rapidly over the past several years. Their goal is to provide employees with the tools, information, and support they need to take responsibility for their careers and for their development planning. Sometimes these initiatives include resource centers; sometimes they focus on workshops and counseling and are more "virtual." Tool kits, self-directed learning materials, and the electronic delivery of services are definitely becoming more and more popular as organizations try to ensure that services are available to all and that programs are cost efficient.

What is needed are practical tools and strategies that individuals can use to increase their self-reliance and build career resilience. The tools should be easy to use and accessible to all. Most of the experience to date has been within the United States. Although some organizations are beginning to deliver programs globally, there is a great deal to learn about how to apply the concepts of career resilience in other countries and with other cultures.

What can career development professionals and career counselors do to implement the concept of career resilience?

- Communicate to clients how changes in the nature of employment and the employer/employee relationship require greater individual responsibility for actively managing one's career.
- Reframe career development around learning.
- Advocate a broader vision: adopt a wellness/fitness philosophy of career development.
- Broaden the view of self-assessment to include an increased emphasis on values-driven work.

- Include benchmarking of work content and work strategy skills as part of the assessment process.
- Develop a future focus and continually scan the environment for emerging trends to be able to challenge clients' thinking. Read outside the field, think outside the box.
- Help clients develop plans to ensure their ongoing employability.
- Develop practical tools for individuals to use to develop career self-reliance.
- Practice career self-reliance themselves—benchmark their skills against standards of excellence in the field and personally commit to an ongoing learning/development plan.

Summary

Individuals need to develop career self-reliance to succeed in today's work world. Organizations need a resilient work force to compete effectively in today's business environments. Career self-reliant employees make up a resilient work force that in turn gives the organization a sustainable competitive advantage. Career resilience calls for a new relationship based on newly defined shared responsibilities and commitments between workers and the organization. The goal is mutual success: career resilience and employability for the individual and a work force that is highly skilled and competitive for the organization. It is the basis of the new employer/employee contract.

The concept of career resilience developed because the needs of the workplace changed and so did the assumptions upon which career development programs were based. Figure 2 demonstrates that shift.

Traditional Career Development	*Career Resilience*
Stable economic patterns	Volatile; unpredictable market shifts
Hierarchical work structures	Flattened organizations
One-dimensional employment models	Contract/outsourcing and temp blend
Distinct jobs and tasks	Blurring of roles; team approach to work
Dependent relationship; employee mindset	Interdependent relationship; partner mindset

Figure 2. The shifting assumptions of career development programs

As work environments have changed so have the basic elements and emphasis of career development programs. Those programs designed for an earlier time are no longer as successful in meeting the needs of today's workers. Figure 3 outlines some of the differences between traditional career development programs and those based on a career resilience model.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary

Traditional Career Development	*Career Resilience*
Event driven (transition, dissatisfaction with current position)	Lifelong process, proactive
Job matching	Value/work alignment
Focus on promotion, upward movement	Focus on learning and development, horizontal moves
Linear paths	Nonlinear paths
Internal assessment	Internal and external assessment
Focus on motivated, transferable skills	Focus also on job content and work strategy skills
Management directed	Self-directed
Career development plans	Learning/development plans
Targeted to white-collar worker	Open to all levels of organization
Driven by human resource strategy	Driven by business strategy

Figure 3. Changing characteristics of career development programs

The concept of career resilience is applicable to all workers at all levels and to organizations of varying sizes in all industries. It is a powerful concept still in its infancy. It has won acceptance as a realistic approach for career development in today's world. It is the basis of career management and development programs within Fortune 100 companies as well as smaller entrepreneurial ones. It is being used successfully with employees at all levels in different industries. Counselors are using the concept to reframe the work they do with clients and are developing counseling services to help people benchmark their skills and stay career fit. Training programs and other products are being developed based on its principles.

Career self-reliance and career resilience have significant implications for career development. The scope of these concepts is broader than vocational choice, career change, or movement to a new position. Their focus is on how to stay healthy and well in one's career through ongoing learning and development in a world that is in constant redefinition.

Just as the medical field has been redefined by a new emphasis on health and wellness (preventive medicine), the career development field has the opportunity to redefine itself by going beyond career choice, career change, and transitions to help individuals develop behaviors and practices that will ensure their ongoing career health.

References

Items with ED numbers may be ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 7420 Fullerton Road, Suite 100, Springfield, VA 22153-2852, (800) 443-3742, (703) 440-1400.

Arthur, M. B. "The Boundaryless Career: A New Perspective for Organizational Inquiry." ***Journal of Organizational Behavior*** 15 (1994): 295-306.

Barner, R. "The New Career Strategist: Career Management for the Year 2000 and Beyond." ***The Futurist*** 28, no. 5 (September-October 1994): 8-14.

Bartlett, C. A., and Ghoshal, S. "Changing the Role of Top Management: Beyond Strategy to Purpose." ***Harvard Business Review*** 72 no. 6 (November-December 1994): 79-88.

Block, P. ***Stewardship: Choosing Service over Self-Interest.*** San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 1993.

Bowlby, J. "Self-Reliance and Some Conditions that Promote It." ***British Journal of Psychiatry*** 130 (1973): 201-210.

Breuer, N. "Minimize Distractions for Maximum Output." *Personnel Journal* 74, no. 5 (1995): 71-76.

Bridges, W. ***JobShift: How to Prosper in a Workplace without Jobs.*** Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1994.

Byrne, J. A. "The Virtual Corporation." ***Business Week***, February 8, 1993, pp. 98-102.

Carnevale, Anthony Patrick. ***America and the New Economy.*** San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Career Action Center. ***Career Connections.*** Palo Alto, CA: CAC, 1993.

Career Action Center. ***Mission Statement.*** Palo Alto, CA: CAC, 1994.

References

Career Action Center. ***Corporate Connections***. Palo Alto, CA: CAC, 1995.

Carulli, L. M.; Norian, C. L.; and Levine, C. "Employee-Driven Career Development." ***Personnel Administrator*** 34, no. 3 (1989): 66-70.

Caudron, S. "HR Revamps Career Itineraries." ***Personnel Journal*** 73 (April 1994): 64B-64P.

Champy, J. ***Reengineering Management***. New York: Harper Collins, 1995.

Collard, Betsy A. "Career Self-Reliance." ***Career Connections***, 1994, p. 3.

Conner, Daryl R. ***Managing at the Speed of Change***. New York: Villard Books, 1993.

Filipczak, B. "You're on Your Own—Training, Employability and the New Employment Contract." ***Training*** 32, no. 1 (January 1995): 29-36.

Gelatt, H. B., and Gelatt, C. "Self-System-Synergy: A New Model for Career-Life Development." Paper presented at the National Career Development Association national conference, 1995.

Gilley, J. W. "Career Development as a Partnership." ***Personnel Administrator*** 33 no. 4 (1988): 62-68.

Gutteridge T. G.; Leibowitz, Z. B.; and Shore, J. E. ***Organizational Career Development: Benchmarks for Building a World-Class Workforce***. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Hakim, C. ***We Are All Self-Employed: The New Social Contract for Working in a Changed World***. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 1994.

Hall, Douglas T. and Associates. ***The Career Is Dead Long Live the Career: A Relational Approach to Careers***. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Hall, D. T., and Moss, J. "The New 'Career Contract': How It's Different and Why Employees Don't 'Get It..'" Paper for the Executive Development Roundtable, Boston University, 1995.

Handy, C. ***The Age of Unreason***. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1990.

Handy, C. "Trust and the Virtual Organization." ***Harvard Business Review*** 73, no. 3 (May-June 1995): 40-50.

Harari, O. "The New Job Security: You!" ***Management Review*** 84, no. 9 (September 1995): 29-31.

Heckscher, C. ***White-Collar Blues: Management Loyalties in an Age of Corporate Restructuring***. New York: Harper Collins, 1995.

Hequet, M. "Flat and Happy?" ***Training*** 32, no. 4 (April 1995): 29-34. (ERIC No. EJ 500 765)

Hudson, F. M. ***The Adult Years: Mastering the Art of Self-renewal.*** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Institute for the Future. ***The Corporate Toolkit for the Nineties: Organizations, the Work Force, and Technology***. Menlo Park, CA: Institute for the Future, 1993.

Johansen, R., and Swigart, R. ***Upsizing the Individual in the Downsized Organization***. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1994.

Kahn, William A. "Secure Base Relationships at Work." In ***The Career Is Dead, Long Live the Career: A Relational Approach to Careers***, by Douglas T. Hall and Associates, pp. 160-161. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Kanter, R. M. "Thriving Locally in the Global Economy." ***The Commonwealth*** 89, no. 41 (October 9, 1995): 1-4.

Kaye, B. L. ***A Guide for Career Development Practitioners***. San Diego, CA: University Associates, 1985.

Kaye, B. L., and Farren, C. "Up Is Not the Only Way." ***Training and Development*** 50, no. 2 (February 1996): 48-53.

References

Kaye, B. L., and Leibowitz, Z. B. "Career Development--Don't Let It Fizzle." ***HR Magazine*** 73, no. 9 (1994): 78-83.

Kissler, G. D. "The New Employment Contract." ***Human Resource Management*** 33, no. 3 (1994): 335-352.

Kotter, J. P. ***The New Rules: How to Succeed in Today's Post-Corporate World***. New York: Free Press, 1995.

Koonce, R. "Becoming Your Own Career Coach." ***Training and Development*** 49, no. 1 (January 1995): 18-25. (ERIC No. EJ 495 815)

Kram, Kathy. "A Relational Approach to Career Development." In ***The Career Is Dead, Long Live the Career: A Relational Approach to Careers***, by Douglas T. Hall and Associates, pp. 132-157. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Krumboltz, J. D. "A Social Learning Theory of Career Decision Making." Revised and reprinted in ***Social Learning and Career Decision Making***, edited by A. M. Mitchell, G. B. Jones, and J. D. Krumboltz. Cranston, RI: Carroll Press, 1979.

Krumboltz, J. D. "A Learning Theory of Career Counseling." In ***Integrating Career Theory and Practice***. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Press, 1996.

Leibowitz, Z. B.; Farren, C.; and Kaye, B. L. ***Designing Career Development Systems***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Leibowitz, Z. B.; Feldman, B. A.; and Mosley, S. H. "Career Development for Nonexempt Employees: Issues and Possibilities." In ***Career Development: Theory and Practice***, edited by D. H. Montross and C. J. Shinkman, pp. 324-335. Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas, 1992.

London, Manuel, ed. ***Employees, Careers, and Job Creation***. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

London, Manuel, and Moore, Edward M. ***Career Management and Survival in the Workplace.*** San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Marshall, Jonathan. "Don't Believe All the Bad News." ***San Francisco Chronicle***, March 11, 1996, Sec. B, p. 1.

Meyer, J. P.; Allen, N. J.; and Smith, C. A. "Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78 (1993): 538-551.

Mirvis, P. H., and Hall, D. T. "Psychological Success and the Boundaryless Career." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 15 (1994): 365-380.

Morrison, D. E. "Psychological Contracts and Change." *Human Resource Management* 33, no. 3 (1994): 353-372.

Murray, M. "Thanks, Goodbye: Amid Record Profits, Companies Continue to Lay Off Employees." *Wall Street Journal*, May 4, 1995, Sec. A, p. 1.

Otte, F. L., and Kahnweiler, W. M. "Long-range Career Planning during Turbulent Times." *Business Horizons* 38, no. 1 (1995): 2-7.

Schein, E. H. *Organizational Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Schein, E. H. *Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Schein, E. H. *Career Survival: Strategic Job and Role Planning*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Co., 1993.

Sears, S. "A Definition of Career Guidance Terms: A National Vocational Guidance Association Perspective." *Vocational Guidance Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (December 1982): 137-143.

Slavenski, L., and Buckner, M. *Career Development Programs in the Workplace. Information Series No. 333*. Columbus: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Center on Education and Training for Employment, The Ohio State University, 1988. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 681)

Souerwine, A. H. "The Manager's Role in Career Counseling." In *Career Development: Theory and Practice*, edited by D. H. Montross and C. J. Shinkman, pp. 306-323. Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas, 1992.

References

Uchitelle, Louis, and Kleinfield, N. R. "On the Battlefields of Business, Millions of Casualties." *New York Times*, March 3, 1996, Sec. 1, p. 1.

Waterman, R. H.; Waterman, J. A.; and Collard, B. A. "Toward a Career-Resilient Workforce." *Harvard Business Review* 72, no. 4 (July-August 1994): 87-95. (ERIC No. EJ 485 904)

IN 366 $7.00

Career Resilience in a Changing Workplace, by Betsy Collard, John W. Epperheimer, and Diane Saign

Examines the effects of workplace changes on career development. Describes the new employment contract and a new approach to career development, based on the concept of individual career self-reliance. Presents a career resilience model for career development.

ORDERING INSTRUCTIONS

To order additional copies, please use order number and title. Orders of $10.00 or less should be prepaid. Make remittance payable to the Center on Education and Training for Employment. Mail order to:

Center on Education and Training for Employment
Center Publications
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

Prices listed are in effect at the time of publication of this book. Prices include standard shipping and handling by the best direct method within the continental United States. Priority shipments will be charged at actual shipping costs plus 5% handling fee. Prices are subject to change without notice.

Quantity Discounts

Orders of ten (10) or more items, as listed by publication number and title, with a total dollar value for the order of:

$201 to $300, the discount is 5%
$301 to $400, the discount is 10%
$401 and above, the discount is 15%

International Orders

All orders, in any amount, from outside the United States and its possessions are to be paid in U.S. currency. Additional postage and handling charges may be added for foreign shipments if necessary.